

REMARKS

It is respectfully submitted that claims 54-82 are currently pending in this application. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

In item 3 on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 54-65, 67, 69-80 and 82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as being anticipated by Jones et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,415,307). In item 26 on page 6 of the Office Action, claims 66, 68 and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones in view of Hanson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,463,461). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 54 recites, among other novel features, “implementing the revision to the content list at the field station; and **transmitting the revision** to the end user station for revision of the content list at the end user station”. (Emphasis Added). It is respectfully submitted that Jones fails to disclose, teach or suggest these features.

Instead, in column 2, lines 43-52, Jones discloses that a list of content of the pages of the publication can be displayed. The list of content for each page is displayed such that the passages of text (articles or stories) are listed in the order of importance, which can be attached to them by the way in which they are formatted on the page of the publication by the editors. When such content lists are to be updated, it appears Jones teaches regenerating the list of content associated with a publication, and retransmitting the entire publication rather than revising the content list as recited in the currently pending claims. As one example, column 2, line 61- through column 3, line 5 of Jones, discloses rapidly obtaining each publication from the publisher, and rapidly updating the publication in response to each new edition. Updating the publication in response to a new edition suggests that an entire new edition, rather than just revisions to the previous edition, are received. This understanding is reinforced by the passage at

col. 5, lines 26-45. This passage discusses the series of steps that are performed to group the various text and images on the pages of a publication into stories. This passage states that this grouping function is performed for each edition of a newspaper that is published in a single day: “in the case of a newspaper for which there are several publications in a day, this process must be carried out [sic, for] each publication as quickly as possible in order that the information can be made available to users without delay.” Col. 5, lines 41-45. In other words, each time a new edition of the publication is received, each of the pages is examined to determine what text and pictures belong to which story. This re-transmission of an entire publication is exactly what the method of claim 54 avoids by transmitting *revisions* to a content list rather than re-transmitting the content list.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Jones fails to teach the feature of **“implementing the revision to the content list at the field station; and transmitting the revision to the end user station for revision of the content list at the end user station”**, as recited by Applicant in claim 54. Jones is merely directed to the simultaneous display of a graphical representation of a printed publication, or part of a publication, and text data appearing in the printed publication wherein a list of contents for each page are displayed such that the passages of text (articles or stories) **are listed in the order of importance**. See, for example, FIG. 2 of Jones. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Jones fails to show each and every element of Applicant’s claims. In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

Moreover, claim 69 recites “revising a content list and a transmitter for transmitting the content list and a message including a revision to the content list to a field station, ... and a transmitter for transmitting the content list and the message to an end user station”. (Emphasis

Added). It is respectfully submitted that Jones fails to teach or suggest these features for at least the similar reasons explained above.

Further, none of the cited references, either singularly or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest the features disclosed by Applicant in claims 54 and 69. More specifically, on pages 6-7 of the Office Action, claims 66, 68 and 81 were rejected as unpatentable over the combination of Jones as a primary reference with Hanson serving as a secondary reference. However, nothing was cited or has been found in Hanson suggesting modification of Jones to overcome the deficiencies discussed above. Since claims 66, 68 and 81 depend from claims 54 and 69, it is submitted that claims 66, 68 and 81 patentably distinguish over Jones for the reasons discussed above with respect to 54 and 69.


For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 54 and 69, along with the remaining dependent claims, define patentable subject matter.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, Applicants submit that this application is now in condition for allowance and therefore request favorable consideration. If any issues remain which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicants counsel, James M. Heintz at 202.861.4167.

Respectfully submitted,

DLA PIPER US LLP


James M. Heintz
Registration No. 41,828

Uchendu O. Anyaso
Registration No. 51,411

1200 Nineteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-2412
Telephone No. 202.861.3900
Facsimile No. 202.223.2085